REPORT OF THE SHORE PROTECTION BOARD
HELD ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2011

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Shore Protection Board was called to order on Thursday, October 27, 2011, at 9:02 a.m. in Town Council Chambers.

II. ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Chairman E. Llwyd Ecclestone, Vice Chair Bobbie Lindsay Buck, Mr. Kane Baker, Mr. Pat Cooper, Mr. Gerald Frank, Mr. Lee David Goldstein, and Mr. Lewis Katz.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Ecclestone led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF PRIOR SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEETINGS

A. APRIL 4, 2011, MEETING

Motion to approve the minutes of the April 4, 2011, meeting was made by Board Member Cooper, seconded by Board Member Goldstein, and approved unanimously.

B. APRIL 28, 2011, MEETING

Motion to approve the minutes of the April 28, 2011, meeting was made by Board Member Goldstein, seconded by Board Member Cooper, and approved unanimously.

V. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEMBERS

Board Member Cooper stated that the Shore Protection Board's budget was based upon no receipt of outside funds for shore protection because there may not be funds from any other source. He said that to the extent that outside funds become available for shore protection, he would like a recommendation to go before Town Council for the funds to be placed into a shore reserve fund to be used for projects from Plan A that were not included in Plan B. Town Manager Elwell suggested that the item be added to the agenda for discussion following the presentation by Ms. Erickson.

Board Member Cooper reported that during conversation between the Mayor and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), the FDEP had indicated their openness to providing additional funds to Palm Beach, possibly up to $1 million, for beach renourishment if the Town was to put bathrooms at Mid-Town. He asked the Shore Board members if they had an opinion about the bathrooms and if it could be added to the agenda. Town Manager Elwell reported that the Town Council would again discuss the issue on November 8. He said it was more of a general policy than a shore protection issue. Chair Ecclestone suggested the matter be discussed as part of Approval of the Agenda.

VI. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS - 3 MINUTE LIMIT PLEASE

Sanford Kuvin, 149 East Inlet Drive, spoke about the submerged pipe from the Sand Transfer Plant to Angler Avenue and its potentially disastrous environmental impact on Reach 2 and significant mitigation costs. He said that the second pipe should be abandoned by the Town and the Shore Board and should be de-authorized by the Congress as a waste of taxpayer's money

Robert Barron of Coastal Growers, Inc. gave an update on the dune plantings he had recently completed for private owners. He spoke about the new FDEP requirements for permitting of private projects saying they were an unjustified increase in regulation and, in his opinion, discouraged private investment in conservation. Town Manager Elwell stated that if there was some change in the regulatory atmosphere, it was not something that the Town had any control over. He suggested that staff could further address the issue with FDEP staff and report back to the Board. There was discussion regarding the FDEP regulations, sea turtle monitoring, and the planting on the dunes.

Board Member Katz asked the percentage of sand lost over the summer in front of Phipps Park, the golf course, and any other Town-owned properties. Town Manager Elwell replied that the Board would be reviewing the annual survey information and sediment budget in January.

Board Member Katz asked for clarification of a statement made by Mr. Barron regarding the refusal by the Town to accept private funds offered to plant sea oats on public property. Robert Weber, Coastal Coordinator, replied that a permit had been received from the State for the Phipps Ocean Park project and it did not include dune plantings. He said that a modification to the project would have been required to conduct the plantings. He added that the plantings occurred generally after March 1 and it would have been a liability to do that activity during turtle season without sea turtle monitoring. Board Member Katz said that when the Town designs a project, it should look when to see what is needed to protect the project.

Chair Ecclestone agreed saying that any permit should include sea oats to protect the project. He said that for individual plantings up and down the beach, the approval should be kept local. Town Manager Elwell summarized that dune plantings would be included in the design scope for future beach nourishment projects. He said that staff would follow up with state regulators about the regulatory changes regarding the requirement for a permit to do plantings for private property owners.

Board Member Katz proposed a formal presentation be made to the Shore Board about dune protection. He suggested Mr. Barron could prepare the presentation. He asked Mr. Barron to work with Town staff to move forward in a constructive way. Chair Ecclestone suggested the possibility of a presentation by a turtle expert also.

Vice Chair Lindsay Buck suggested that other municipalities be contacted to join with the Town regarding the regulatory issue and fees being imposed.

Board Member Goldstein added that Mark Taynton should be contacted to meet with Mr. Weber regarding the dune legislation.

VII. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion was made by Vice Chair Lindsay Buck and seconded by Board Member Katz to approve the agenda with the addition of the management of unexpected funding and a discussion of bathrooms at Mid-Town. The motion was approved unanimously.

VIII. SHORELINE CONDITION ASSESSMENT [Robert Weber, Coastal Coordinator]

Mr. Weber gave a power point presentation with photographs of all reaches comparing the conditions over the last few months to those in the spring and to conditions one-to-two years ago. He spoke about the spring/summer profile compared to the fall/winter profile. Board Member Katz stated that the profile in front of Phipps Park was much flatter than the portion where sea oats are planted. He asked for data to include the dune slope in front of the Reef Condominium and the dune slope at the south end of Phipps Ocean Park.

Vice Chair Lindsay Buck asked the level of protection of the beaches compared to a year ago. Mr. Weber replied that the condition of the beaches today was better than this time last year because of the beach projects that had been completed. Vice Chair Lindsay Buck asked about measuring the level of protection from the dune projects. Mr. Weber responded that the data that was included in Plan B, prior to the dune restoration projects, and showed 25-year storm protection throughout the Town.

Board Member Katz questioned if the Town had real protection on all areas in the event of a major storm. Mr. Weber replied that according to the work done by the consultants or by modeling, the current protection, based on variables of sand and seawalls in certain areas, concludes that the Town does have protection in all areas.

IX. NORTH END SAND SEARCH RESULTS AND SOUTH END SAND SEARCH PROGRESS REPORT [Michael Jenkins, Ph.D, P.E., Coastal Engineering Team Leader, Applied Technology & Management, Inc., & Gary Zarillo, Ph.D., P.G., Principal, SEA, Inc.]

North End Sand Search Results

Dr. Mike Jenkins of Applied Technology & Management, Inc. (ATM) and Dr. Gary Zarillo of S.E.A., Inc. gave a presentation on the north end sand search. He reported that most areas were excluded because the sand was very, very fine and not beach compatible. He further reported that three areas had been identified that could be considered for beach projects. He reviewed the three areas:

- North Borrow Area 1 located south of the Juno borrow area (source delineated and used by the County).

- North Borrow Area 2 located immediately north of the Inlet and offshore. The sand is basically material that long term has accumulated in that area and is coarser than the native sand in the near shore area.

- North Borrow Area 3 is basically an accumulation of natural sand and continued near shore placements by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps).

Dr. Jenkins stated that the north borrow area was the main source and highest quality source of sand found. He reviewed the conditions, grain size, and volume of sand at each site. He stated that the next step in the process would be to take the sites to permitting. He spoke about the preliminary compatibility analysis. He gave alternatives and constraints associated with each. He reviewed the probable costs with the three borrow areas based on current industry standards. He cautioned that the cost was based on fluctuating gas and oil prices. He stated that the next step would be to define the projects, the amount of sand needed, and the exact areas of sand that would be used for the projects.

Chair Ecclestone questioned how the Town would retain the rights to the sand. Dr. Jenkins replied that the process of doing the study was the claim to the sand and the best way to secure the rights would be to dig the area.

Vice Chair Lindsay Buck asked if the number of carbonates in the sand was a function of how milky it would be when it gets in the water. Dr. Jenkins replied that the percent of silt/fines was a function of how milky the water would be. Vice Chair Lindsay Buck expressed concerns with the color and "milky-ness" from north sources. She stated that sand in Juno tends to be much grayer. Dr. Jenkins explained that off shore sand and native sand were not identical. He further explained that previous Juno projects used a different source which had more silt. He stated that there are times when there are immediate post project issues with that "milky-ness." He added that the "milky-ness" usually occurred after a storm event. A discussion followed. Dr. Jenkins stated that the placed material would be gray, but would lighten and mix with the tan beach sand.

In response to a question from Vice Chair Lindsay Buck, Dr. Jenkins stated that the sand from the Inlet was slightly over .2 mm grain size and had about 2% silt. He said the sand at the by-passing plant was less than 1% silt and slightly coarser, 0.3 mm range.

Board Member Katz asked how Dr. Jenkins would respond if the sand was much finer or a lot more rock was found once drilling started. Dr. Jenkins replied that within the permitting there has to be a QAQC Plan measuring the quality. He reported that the quality had been quantified based on State and Federal standards.

Board Member Baker asked how the sand would be moved to the beaches without incurring enormous costs with dredgers or machinery. Dr. Jenkins responded that the cost analysis was based on existing dredger technology, which would be hopper-based technology. He stated that the current cost would be $10-$14 per yard to move the material to the beaches. He further stated that the hopper-based technology was the industry standard for moving several hundred thousand yards of sand. There was discussion regarding the costs and the technology to be used. Board Member Baker asked the Board to investigate other means of moving the sand.

In response to a question from Board Member Cooper regarding the proximity of the borrow areas to the shore, Dr. Jenkins stated that a full wave analysis had been completed for the north borrow area and FDEP should have no question regarding the use of it. He said there are concerns with the two areas near the Inlet. He reported that an analysis had been made to justify that the impacts were not significant to preclude their use and an argument could be made that the impact would be no worse than that of the Inlet. Board Member Cooper expressed concern with borrow area 3.

Chair Ecclestone asked if coarser sand could be used for overfill. Dr. Jenkins replied that it could be used and was usually included in the design.

<u>South End Sand Search Results</u>

Dr. Jenkins reported that the south end sand search was started later than the north end. He stated that most of the sand found was very fine. He reported that three new areas of coarse sand were found. He noted that borrow areas III and IV were from the 2006 project. He cautioned that these were search areas and not final borrow areas until more study had been completed.

- South Borrow Area 1, located at the middle of Mid-Town and just off-shore of the hardbottom.

- South Borrow Area 2, just north of Widener's Curve and beyond Sloan's Curve and located about 1600' off shore.

- South Borrow Area 3, located in the area from the Lake Worth Pier south. There is good coarse material in this area located closer to shore than the fine material found in the past.

Board Member Katz stated there is a method to use material from the coarser areas but at a high cost. Dr. Jenkins stated that it usually adds about a $1 a cubic yard.

Dr. Jenkins distributed sand samples from the three search areas. He stated that an assumption was made that 25% of the search areas would provide usable materials and the cut would be less than 10 ft. He reviewed the potential yield. He said there could be a major cost savings in considering the sources. Regarding the nearness of the borrow areas to the shoreline, Dr. Jenkins reported that ATM had been in consultation with FDEP. He spoke about the preliminary wave impacts and transport rates. He reported that the final detailed investigations would occur in two weeks. In response to questions from the Board Member Frank, Dr. Jenkins stated he would provide an update to the Board in January.

Board Member Frank asked that in looking at the grain size, the fact that the sand source was so close, and that transportation costs would be reduced, could sand from the south area be used for the Reach 8 project. Mr. Weber replied that it could not be used because the permit application had been submitted to the State and Corps using Ortona sand. He added that due to the sensitivity of the issue and the rulings from the administrative hearings, it would best to use the permit location as submitted.

X. PHIPPS OCEAN PARK (REACH 7) BEACH RESTORATION & STABILIZATION PROJECT DESIGN RESULTS AND ADVANCED DESIGN PROPOSAL [Michael Walther, P.E., Principal, Coastal Technology Corporation, & Robert Weber, Coastal Coordinator]

Mr. Michael Walther, president and principal engineer of Coastal Technology Corporation, gave a presentation on the Phipps Ocean Park (Reach 7) project. He reported that the project was focused on the southern portion of Reach 5 near Wideners Curve to just north of the Lake Worth pier but the Corps essentially eliminated the north area to avoid impact to the hardbottom. He further reported that the approach was to look at the protection of buildings and structures and a recreational beach. He reviewed information on the level of upland property protection from 2001 to 2009, the 2009 recreational beach width, and the 2011 beach conditions. He stated that based on the Town's monitoring data since the 2006 beach fill, there was an estimated longshore transport deficit of about 75,000 cubic yards per year not moving into Reach 7 due to structures to the north of Reach 7.

Mr. Walther gave six alternatives formulated to develop a project for the Phipps Park area. He reported on the meetings with FDEP, the Corps, other Federal commenting agencies, and the Surfrider Association.

Mr. Walther gave the recommendations of Coastal Tech:

- No action
- F1-beach fill as permitted and construction in 2006 but expanded south to north of the Lake Worth pier to the Palm Worth condo
- F3-beach fill from Phipps Park to Kreusler Park with expanded fill at the northern end
- G1-beach fill (same as F1) with a series of nine groins from Phipps Ocean Park to the Par 3 Golf Course
- G3-beach fill as constructed in 2006, weighted in the north end with two groins at north end of Phipps Ocean Park

Mr. Walther outlined the future tasks to be authorized.

Town Manager Elwell explained that the Shore Board would make a recommendation to the Town Council. He stated that the recommended funding for the advanced design was $228,877 for the work necessary to file a joint coastal permit application. He recommended the Shore Board establish a project budget of $240,000, which includes a contingency. He reported that if the Town Council approves the recommendation, by March a full presentation of the results of the analysis of the four recommendations would be made to the Board for review.

Board Member Goldstein asked the number of groins included in G3. Mr. Walther responded there would be two groins at the north end of Phipps Park but it was subject to change based on the numeric models. Board Member Goldstein asked if the groins would have to be kept filled. Mr. Walther replied affirmatively saying that they would be filled by the recurring renourishment and would be required to be mitigated but they would be self-mitigating.

Board Member Frank asked what kind of groin would be used. Mr. Walther responded that for purposes of evaluation, he had looked at a concrete pile panel groin that could be adjusted in the future if necessary. He explained that the rock groin was avoided due to its footprint. He said he would propose in the permit that the refilling of the groins wait until the next renourishment. He reported that the groins would be located relatively near the midpoint of Phipps Park.

Board Member Katz asked that a vote on the recommendation be postponed until after the Erickson report.

Vice Chair Lindsay Buck expressed concern that the area from Sloan's Curve through Phipps Ocean Park would only receive some dune restoration but no groins, and the area that would be renourished (south of R123) currently had 100 year protection. She said she understood that the Corps would not permit groins in the Sloan's Curve area. A discussion followed on the placement of the groins and the beach fill project. Mr. Walther explained the need for the renourishment project saying it would continue to lose about 75,000 cubic yards of sand per year, there would be an unraveling of the fill on the north end that would spread south, and the beach fill would be needed to restore and maintain the protection.

Chair Ecclestone suggested the Town renegotiate with Corps to protect the hot spot. He said he believed in shorter groins with more groins. Board Members Katz and Goldstein agreed with the idea of renegotiating with Corps.

Board Member Goldstein asked for information from Penny Cutt, a former employee of the Corps, as to why Corps turned down the Phipps Park project and how the Town could get approval of the project. Ms. Cutt reported that the Corps could not permit the project that was proposed at that time because the Reach 7 design would have caused substantial impacts to hardbottom resources with a fill template that the models showed would have been eroded within a year. She said that at that time, she and John Studt had strongly recommended that a structural solution be evaluated. She recommended that Rob Weber and the Mayor talk to the Corps office to review the statement of findings that was written on that project because the recommendation was to evaluate a structural solution with a reduced fill template that would prolong the life of the proposed project and reduce the proposed impacts. Chair Ecclestone proposed the Board implement Ms. Cutt's recommendations.

Mr. Walther offered a parallel recommendation to add back into the recommendation for the current project the G2 alternative with some reduction of the fill in the northern area. Town Manager Elwell explained that the G2 alternative would extend the project up to Sloan's Curve and include the groins in front of the condominiums. He asked Mr. Walther if he could include the G2 alternative back into the scope of the work without increasing the fee. Mr. Walther suggested that G2 be switched for another alternative.

Karyn Erickson, Principal Engineer, Erickson Consulting Engineers (ECE), offered some points regarding groin fields saying that the groin field at Mid-Town pep reef modules are laid sideways and are virtually the same size as a rock groin. She stated that concrete panel groins are difficult to design and maintain and sheet pile would be very difficult to get penetration due to the hardbottom. She recommended rock groins which were proven and low maintenance. She further recommended that one or two structures be built to see how they perform. She spoke about the use of T-head groins which are adjustable. She stated that if the project would impact the hardbottom, coarser sand (.32-.38) should be used. She recommended the use of sand from the Bahamas.

Mr. Walther summarized the recommendation: to move forward as proposed with the addition of alternative G2 with minimal fill to fill those groins that are proposed north of Phipps Park to Sloan's Curve. A discussion followed on the parameters of the project, the source of the sand, and the scope of work.

In response to questions from Board Member Katz, Mr. Walther explained that the proposal does not intend to compensate for the minimum beach. He stated that Coastal Tech's interpretation of the criteria in the Town's Comprehensive Management Plan was for a 25 year storm level of protection for upland buildings. He explained that groins were proposed to maintain a minimum beach, and it was envisioned that there was already sufficient protection to meet the criteria of a 25 year storm protection. He added that in alternative G2 there was the level of protection for a 50 year storm event stabilized by the rock along the shoreline.

A lengthy discussion followed on groins (type and placement), the protection of upland buildings, the sand source, and the use and protection of seawalls.

Ms. Erickson said she believed it was important to have a structure to hold the sand in between Sloan's Curve and Phipp's Park, and one at the south end of Phipp's Park. She suggested somewhere between 2 and 3 structures and high quality sand.

Mr. Walther recommended the Board move forward with alternatives that had been outlined in the report but substitute alternative G2, which extends the groin field up to R116.5, in lieu of alternative F1, the 2006 project. He agreed that structures would have to be built in order to maintain sand in the north end of the project.

Town Manager Elwell stated that the additional analysis of the alternatives would determine the number of groins, where they would be located, the length, and the type. He asked for additional clarification from Mr. Walther regarding his $228,000 proposal and if it would include the substitution of G2 for F1, the additional analysis of the offshore sand alternative, and the additional analysis related to T-head rather than concrete pile groins. Mr. Walther responded that Coastal Tech had anticipated both structures but, based on the input from the regulatory agencies and Ms. Erickson's suggestions, they would look for a submerged T-head structure that would not interfere with turtles. He added that Coastal Tech had already anticipated some evaluation of alternative sand sources. Mr. Walther indicated that there would be no increase in the fee.

Town Manager Elwell proposed that the Board adopt the recommendation as outlined with the modification (G2 for F1) and with the additional assurance that the Mayor and, at her discretion, other parties would reach out to the regulatory agencies, particularly the Corps, regarding the issue of including the area north of Phipp's Park.

Motion was made by Board Member Katz and seconded by Board Member Goldstein to approve the recommendation of staff (in the agenda backup) with the substitution of analyzing option G2 and eliminating option F1. The motion was approved unanimously.

Board Member Cooper asked about a revised cost estimate. Town Manager Elwell replied that the revised construction cost estimate would be addressed in the material for the next phase of work with minimum and maximum costs for each alternative.

XIII. PRESENTATION BY KARYN ERICKSON, ERICKSON CONSULTING ENGINEERS, REGARDING THE TOWN'S COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Ms. Erickson reviewed her report prepared on behalf of a number of property owners to gather and review information about Plan A and Plan B. She addressed three questions:

1. Does the Plan B provide its stated purpose of protecting the upland structures from a severe storm, specifically a 25 year return period event?
2. Is the present Plan B technically and fundamentally sound?
3. Is the FY2012-2022 plan budget based on reasonable assumptions with respect to cost and are those projections accurate?

She reviewed her recommendations and conclusions.

Board Member Goldstein asked for clarification regarding the finding that the sand volume for Reach 8 was only 50% as outlined in the budget Plan B. Ms. Erickson responded that the sand source was unclear. She suggested the use of a Bahamian sand source because it had a tight grain size so the sand compacts and is more resistant to erosion. She said that the Plan B budget underestimated the sand that would be required over ten years to provide a reasonable level of protection.

Board Member Frank asked if Ms. Erickson's findings took into consideration the migration of sand from Reach 7 which was filling sections of the south end of Reach 8. Ms. Erickson replied that she did account for the migration of sand; however, with three dune projects over ten years, there were no contingencies for storm events.

Board Member Frank questioned the finding regarding improvements of the deteriorated groins in Reach 2 and 3. Ms. Erickson explained that when a groin drops and becomes deteriorated it no longer holds even a small filet of sand and the small filets of sand functionally provide and maintain the sand in the upper portion of the profile along the seawalls. She stated that in conversations with staff she understood that the groins that had deteriorated were no longer planned to be improved because it would result in a recreational beach. She said that her position was it would not be a recreational beach but a storm protection beach.

Board Member Katz asked if the groins on Reach 6 obstructed the free flow of sand for Reaches 7 and 8. Ms. Erickson answered that she would be surprised if removing the structure would have a significant impact on moving the sand south. She explained that the sand would go cross shore, move off shore and bypass the north end of Reach 7. In reply to a question from Board Member Katz, she spoke about structures she had designed on the open sea. She also spoke about T-head structures saying that if a portion of rock needed to be removed because it was not allowing enough sand to pass, it could done or the weir behind it can be reduced to allow the sand to move through it more quickly.

Vice Chair Lindsay Buck asked how sand could be placed in front of the seawalls in Reach 2 because it gets scoured and washed away every winter. She also spoke about groins saying that the Board had heard that if the groins were rebuilt, they would only hold about 10,000 cubic yards of sand and that was not enough to the improve protection of upland property, but it would beautify the beach. Town Manager Elwell clarified that the Town's projects seaward of the seawall would not provide enough sand in front of the seawall to meaningfully increase the amount of protection provided by the seawall. A discussion followed on the placement of sand in front of seawalls.

Regarding the proposed plan for Phase 2, the extension of the sand transfer plant, Vice Chair Lindsay Buck asked about the viability of moving that sand to put a higher volume into the litoral drift that is further south. Ms. Erickson said she strongly supports moving sand to the south mechanically so it doesn't accrete and become locked behind the shoal system.

Vice Chair Lindsay Buck asked Ms. Erickson if she had an opinion on whether the rock revetment placed by the state on A1A for evacuation and storms had anything to do with the sand moving south offshore and not depositing on the north end of Sloan's Curve. Ms. Erickson agreed that the revetment did obstruct the flow of the sand. She stated that she had been successful in going before the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) and the Corps to get money for damages caused as a result of their actions.

Board Member Katz stated that the Board should get a report from time to time about the flow of sand and should look at structures to see if are doing damage.

Chair Ecclestone thanked Ms. Erickson for her report.

Town Manager Elwell stated it was the intent of staff to prepare a report regarding Ms. Erickson's report and on December 6 discuss the issues further to assist the Shore Protection Board in deciding whether or not to modify Plan B.

XI. MONITORING AND PERMITTING UPDATES [Robert Weber, Coastal Coordinator]

Townwide Physical Monitoring

Mr. Weber reported that the physical monitoring data was collected in early October and September and the data reduction process had begun. He further reported that the results would be included on the monitoring reports submitted to the State as part of the permit requirements and for the sediment budget. He stated that the sediment budget was typically presented to the Board in January.

Biological Monitoring

Mr. Weber reported that the field work for the biological monitoring was complete. He stated that staff would meet with the Town's consultants and FDEP to develop a plan for Mid-Town and any secondary impacts from the 2006 project.

Sea Turtle Nesting Monitoring

Mr. Weber reported that the sea turtle season started well but the near passing of Hurricane Irene during the peak of the season washed out a lot of the nests. Chair Ecclestone requested a report of the location of the nests before Hurricane Irene.

Sand Transfer Plant (Phase II) Permitting

Mr. Weber reported that the Town had received the REI from FDEP and initial comments back from Corps. He stated that a report would be prepared for the December Shore Board meeting.

Town Manager Elwell stated he felt it was important for staff to meet with directly affected residents in the north end about the second phase of the Sand Transfer Plant. He further stated that he anticipated holding a public workshop later in the season (February or March) about the expected plans, the benefits and the impacts.

South End Palm Beach Restoration (Reach 8) Permitting

Mr. Weber stated the project was still in permitting and CSI was preparing a response to the lengthy information requested from the Corps.

Regarding the Palm Beach County project, Mr. Weber reported that the County was again consulting with Taylor Engineering for the EIS. He further reported that the project was still in the scoping portion of the EIS and he anticipated it would be at least a year before any comments were received regarding the EIS for the Central Palm Beach County Comprehensive Erosion Control Project. He stated that the Town still had its contribution of $100,000 for the cost sharing effort. Town Manager Elwell added that depending upon the results of the EIS and where the County plans to go with the project, staff would visit with the Shore Board and the Town Council to reassess whether the Town should remain in the project and the level of commitment.

Board Member Goldstein proposed that all the Town's coastal engineers get together with staff on all major coastal projects. He said that he believed that the other engineers could add to the projects and that they should be working more in sync than individually. Town Manager Elwell cautioned that it might be not the best approach to expect every single project to be run through a panel peer review approach because it could be expensive. He agreed that it was an interesting idea and would be a check and balance with the engineers. He asked time to reflect on the idea of how an element could be incorporated into the methods of dealing with the Town's consultants but with assurance that it would be cost effective. Board Member Katz agreed with Mr. Goldstein's comments on the use of input from coastal experts for major projects.

XII. PROPOSAL FROM JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC. FOR COMPLIANCE GUIDANCE FOR THE TOWN'S COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM [Peter B. Elwell, Town Manager]

Town Manager Elwell stated that staff was recommending that Jacobs Engineering Group be retained to assist in the administration of the Town's Coastal Management Program. He gave the background for his recommendation. He explained that Jacobs would provide a check and balance, advice, and review of the coastal program. He stated that the cost would be $24,540, would not require Town Council approval, and would be paid from the coastal fund.

Motion was made by Board Member Frank, seconded by Board Member Goldstein, and unanimously approved to approve the proposal from Jacobs Engineering Group for compliance guidance for the Town's Coastal Management Program.

Grant Funds – Town Manager Elwell assured the Board that money received from the State or Federal government as grants to reimburse money spent on any of coastal projects had always gone back into the coastal fund and would always go back into the coastal fund. He explained that in order to be prudent about the Town's long term planning, no future assistance from the State or Federal government had been included in the budget. He asked if money was received from the state, should it be viewed as an opportunity to have more coastal work done because of sacrifices made in the planning process, or should the money be viewed as an opportunity to complete the entire program and have less impact on the taxpayers. He suggested that circumstances were strained financially and it would be wise not to view the grant funds as "found" money for a Plan B1. He reminded the Board that the coastal plan was a living, evolving process and it would change over the years as decisions were made regarding the needs. Chair Ecclestone asked that the Board be informed as funds are received and a running total be kept of the amount.

Bathrooms at Mid-Town – Board Member Cooper said he was in favor of putting bathrooms at the Mid-Town Beach because it was the right thing to do. He said he believed that a citizen had offered to pay for it. Town Manager Elwell gave facts regarding the issue. He stated that the FDEP had advised the Mayor that they were currently reviewing rules including the obligation for certain amounts of parking to be provided in relation to secondary beach accesses. He further stated that the obligation for the seven spaces may be eliminated in the future without any further action by the Town. He reported that the FDEP still strongly supports the concept of having public restrooms at the Mid-Town Beach, and it would make the Mid-Town Beach a primary beach access rather than a secondary beach access and, therefore, the Town would become eligible for additional state funding if appropriations are made in the future. He further reported that its November 8 meeting, the Town Council would give further consideration to restrooms at the Mid-Town Beach.

Vice Chair Lindsay Buck and Board Member Frank each spoke in support of the public restrooms.

Motion was made by Board Member Goldstein and seconded by Board Member Katz to recommend to the Town Council that there be bathrooms on the beach at Mid-Town and that it be done tastefully. The motion was approved unanimously.

XIV. DRAFT SHORE PROTECTION BOARD ANNUAL REPORT TO TOWN COUNCIL [Peter B. Elwell, Town Manager]

Town Manager Elwell referred the Board members to page 150 of their back up material. He explained that the Annual report was in the same format as last year. He asked the Board members to let staff know of any concerns with the report. He stated it would be submitted to the Town Council on December 13.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ecclestone adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m.

APPROVED:

E. Llwyd Ecclestone
Chairman